



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,489	04/06/2001	Jarmo Makela	297-006914-US (C01)	5743
2512	7590	05/12/2009	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			ELAHEE, MD S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2614		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		05/12/2009		PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/827,489	MAKELA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	MD S. ELAHEE	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Examiner made an update search and discovered Wang reference. Based on the newly discovered reference examiner made another ground of rejection in view of **Mizikovsky and Wang.**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 01/29/2009. Claims 1-42 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 01/29/2009 Remarks have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 7-9, 12-13, 20, 23-26, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37 and 38, the applicant argues on pages 12-13 that since a combination of some form of electronic device with a radio telephone does not, by itself, mean that all forms of electronic devices can be combined with radio telephones, it is not obvious to integrate the several accessory devices of Mizikovsky into a single portable device. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. According to **In re Larson** 144 U.S.P.Q. 347, when parts are rigidly secured together as a single unit, they function as a unitary whole. However, for the sake of more clarification of rejection, examiner made the 103 rejection based on the teaching of Mizikovsky and Kang.

Regarding claim 23, the applicant argues on pages 13-14 that no combination of Kang and Mizikovsky to teach the features of the presently claimed subject matter. It is because,

Mizikovsky does not disclose such a portable entity and the vehicle radiotelephone of Kang clearly is not portable since if something is installed in a vehicle it can hardly be portable. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. The reason of this disagreement has already been written in the previous office action mailed 03/06/2008.

Thus the examiner maintains the rejection of the claims in view of Mizikovsky and Kang.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 20-22 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 20, the phrase “said reply” in line 5 is indefinite. There are two different “a reply”. It is unclear which “reply” is being referred to by the phrase.

Since claims 21, 22 and 42 are dependent upon claim 20, these claims are also rejected.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 10-11, 18-19, 21-22, 27, 31, 35 and 39 will be allowed after overcoming rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Art Unit: 2614

6. Claims 41 and 42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable after overcoming rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1,7-9, 12-13, 20, 23-26, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** (US 5,058,150).

As to Claims 1,20,23-25,29,33 and 37, with respect to Figures 1-2 and 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method for replying to a call coming to a portable terminal (mobile station 10, Fig.1) wherein, in response to an incoming call,

the portable terminal identifies a caller on the basis of caller ID [i.e., an identification information] (Col. 11, lines 8-15), or

**Mizikovsky** further teaches directing the incoming call to a selected accessory device such as a telephone answering machine (Col. 12, line 30) to service or answer the call (Col. 12, line 34).

**Mizikovsky** further teaches selecting an accessory device (i.e., telephone answering machine (hereinafter TAD)) and the device answers or service the call uniquely (such as TAD generates outgoing message (i.e., OGM) or fax machine generates CNG tone (i.e., calling tone) when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call) (Col. 6, lines 51-67, Col. 7, lines 27-30). Thus, the selected device answers the call reads on claimed “reply”. Also, each selected device must treat/service the call uniquely therefore, each device can produce a specific form of communication to the incoming call such as TAD generates OGM or fax

machine generates CNG tone when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call (Col. 12, lines 25-37).

**Mizikovsky** further teaches the step of identifying the caller is accomplished by the portable terminal (Figure 1, label 50, Figure 2, label 114 and Figure 5, label 516).

**Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that the portable device sends the reply and provides a selected response to the caller **only through an action of the portable terminal** irrespectively of which of said plurality of forms of communication is employed in the selected response.

In other words, **Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that a selected accessory device (i.e., TAD) responses are only sent through the mobile terminal. Also, **Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that the selected device (i.e., TAD) is integrated into the mobile device.

**Kang** teaches that voice analyzing/synthesizing circuit (Fig.2,3, item 221) which is actually telephone answering machine, has been included and integrated into a radio telephone (Fig.2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the TAD of **Mizikovsky** into the mobile station of **Mizikovsky** so that a user is not required to have any external connection to connect to the external TAD to get the benefit of carrying both of the TAD along with the mobile station easily as one unit.

As to Claim 7, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein said reply is at least partly formulated based on the identification of the calling party (Figure 5, label 506).

As to Claim 8, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7 wherein a reply is sent to certain identified calling parties only (Figure 5, labels 508,512).

As to Claim 9, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein the reply to be sent in response to the incoming call is different according to the respective company said call is coming from (Figure 5, labels 508,512,516).

As to Claims 12-13, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein said identification of the calling party is based on registered caller IDs (a telephone notebook) comprised by the communication (Figure 2, label 106).

As to Claims 26,30,34,38, **Mizikovsky** teaches a portable terminal in accordance with claim 25, wherein said step of taking response action comprises sending a reply to the caller, said reply being a voice message (one of the following: a voice message, e-mail message, facsimile, and an SMS message in the form of a character string) (Col. 8, lines 51-59).

11. Claims 2, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** further in view of **Jambhekar et al.** (US 5,848,356).

As to Claims 2,6, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein the portable terminal sends said reply immediately in response to an incoming call, and said plurality of forms of communication include a voice message.

**Mizikovsky** further teaches a facsimile peripheral which suggests a facsimile accessory and facsimile message; a multimedia terminal which suggests an e-mail accessory and response; EIA/TIA 15-54 alert messages which suggests a SMS accessory and response.

However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** does not teach, “an e-mail message, a facsimile message, and an SMS message in the form of a character string”. **Jambhekar** teaches e-mail, facsimile and SMS messages (Figures 5P and 8A). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add e-mail, facsimile and SMS capabilities to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Kang**’s invention for providing callers with response messages as taught by **Jambhekar**’s invention in order not to distract a user by sending pre-programmed responses.

12. Claims 3-5,28,32,36,40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** further in view of **Bremer** (US 6,018,671).

As to Claim 3, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein in response to an incoming call,

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing users with alert signals and, therefore, waits for a user response (Figure 5, label 510). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** does not teach, “the portable terminal alarms and waits during a certain delay, and if a user during said delay does not answer said call, the portable terminal sends said reply”. **Bremer** teaches the limitation (Figure 4, labels 4 16,420). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add default capability to **Mizikovsky**’s

invention in view of **Kang's** invention for providing callers with default messages as taught by Bremer's invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claims 4,28,32,36,40, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein in response to an incoming call, the portable terminal alarms, and:

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing users with alert signals and, therefore, waits for a user response (Figure 5, label 510). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** does not teach, "if a user gives a certain key command, the portable terminal sends said reply". Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add selected message capability to **Mizikovsky's** invention in view of **Kang's** invention for providing callers with selected messages as taught by Bremer's invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claim 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 3, wherein the portable terminal gives a mute soundless alarm (Col. 6, lines 43-50).

13. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** further in view of **Villa-Real** (US 4,481382).

As to Claim 14, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7.

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing selected accessory responses to callers (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** does not teach, "wherein a reminder to call the

identified calling party will be stored into the portable terminal, in order to be presented to a user later". Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add reminder capability to **Mizikovsky**'s invention in view of **Kang**'s invention for alerting users as taught by **Villa-Real**'s invention in order to provide reminders to users when calls become due.

14. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** further in view of **Wolff** et al. (US 5,327,486).

As to Claims 15-17, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance claim 1, wherein said reply includes:

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing callers with selected user accessory responses (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** does not teach, "time information". **Wolff** teaches the limitation (Figures 8-9). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add time capability to **Mizikovsky**'s invention in view of **Kang**'s invention for providing callers with selected time-based messages as taught by **Wolff**'s invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

15. Claims 1,7-9, 12-13, 20, 23-26, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky**.

As to Claims 1,20,23-25,29,33 and 37, with respect to Figures 1-2 and 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a

method for replying to a call coming to a portable terminal (mobile station 10, Fig.1) wherein, in response to an incoming call,

the portable terminal identifies a caller on the basis of caller ID [i.e., an identification information] (Col. 11, lines 8-15), or

**Mizikovsky** further teaches directing the incoming call to a selected accessory device such as a telephone answering machine (Col. 12, line 30) to service or answer the call (Col. 12, line 34).

**Mizikovsky** further teaches selecting an accessory device (i.e., telephone answering machine (hereinafter TAD)) and the device answers or service the call uniquely (such as TAD generates outgoing message (i.e., OGM) or fax machine generates CNG tone (i.e., calling tone) when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call) (Col. 6, lines 51-67, Col. 7, lines 27-30). Thus, the selected device answers the call reads on claimed “reply”. Also, each selected device must treat/service the call uniquely therefore, each device can produce a specific form of communication to the incoming call such as TAD generates OGM or fax machine generates CNG tone when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call (Col. 12, lines 25-37).

**Mizikovsky** further teaches the step of identifying the caller is accomplished by the portable terminal (Figure 1, label 50, Figure 2, label 114 and Figure 5, label 516).

**Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that the portable device sends the reply and provides a selected response to the caller **only through an action of the portable terminal** irrespectively of which of said plurality of forms of communication is employed in the selected response.

In other words, **Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that a selected accessory device (i.e., TAD) responses are only sent through the mobile terminal. Also, **Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that the selected device (i.e., TAD) is integrated into the mobile device.

**Mizikovsky** suggests that accessories are peripherals which have been included into the mobile station and which function together to process incoming calls (Col. 3, lines 1-4 and Col.7, lines 5-7). Further, according to **In re Larson** 144 U.S.P.Q. 347, when parts are rigidly secured together as a single unit, they function as a unitary whole. Further it would be obvious to integrate the peripherals 52 as Accessories into the mobile device so that users are not required to be present at the mobile station for responding to incoming calls.

Therefore, having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious if it is not inherent to one of ordinary skill in the art that the accessories 50 together with the other elements of the mobile station constitute a unitary mobile station and accessory responses from the mobile station are sent only through the mobile station.

As to Claim 7, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein said reply is at least partly formulated based on the identification of the calling party (Figure 5, label 506).

As to Claim 8, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7 wherein a reply is sent to certain identified calling parties only (Figure 5, labels 508,512).

As to Claim 9, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein the reply to be sent in response to the incoming call is different according to the respective company said call is coming from (Figure 5, labels 508,512,516).

As to Claims 12-13, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein said identification of the calling party is based on registered caller IDs (a telephone notebook) comprised by the communication (Figure 2, label 106).

As to Claims 26,30,34,38, **Mizikovsky** teaches a portable terminal in accordance with claim 25, wherein said step of taking response action comprises sending a reply to the caller, said reply being a voice message (one of the following: a voice message, e-mail message, facsimile, and an SMS message in the form of a character string) (Col. 8, lines 51-59).

16. Claims 2, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Jambhekar** et al. (US 5,848,356).

As to Claims 2,6, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein the portable terminal sends said reply immediately in response to an incoming call, and said plurality of forms of communication include a voice message.

**Mizikovsky** further teaches a facsimile peripheral which suggests a facsimile accessory and facsimile message; a multimedia terminal which suggests an e-mail accessory and response; EIA/TIA 15-54 alert messages which suggests a SMS accessory and response.

However, **Mizikovsky** does not teach, “an e-mail message, a facsimile message, and an SMS message in the form of a character string”. **Jambhekar** teaches e-mail, facsimile and SMS messages (Figures 5P and 8A). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add e-mail, facsimile and SMS capabilities to **Mizikovsky**’s invention for providing callers with response messages as taught by **Jambhekar**’s invention in order not to distract a user by sending pre-programmed responses.

17. Claims 3-5,28,32,36,40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Bremer** (US 6,018,671).

As to Claim 3, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein in response to an incoming call,

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing users with alert signals and, therefore, waits for a user response (Figure 5, label 510). However, **Mizikovsky** does not teach, “the portable terminal alarms and waits during a certain delay, and if a user during said delay does not answer said call, the portable terminal sends said reply”. **Bremer** teaches the limitation (Figure 4, labels 4 16,420). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add default capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention for providing callers with default messages as taught by Bremer’s invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claims 4,28,32,36,40, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein in response to an incoming call, the portable terminal alarms, and:

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing users with alert signals and, therefore, waits for a user response (Figure 5, label 510). However, **Mizikovsky** does not teach, “if a user gives a certain key command, the portable terminal sends said reply”. Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add selected message capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention for providing callers with selected messages as taught by Bremer’s invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claim 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 3, wherein the portable terminal gives a mute soundless alarm (Col. 6, lines 43-50).

18. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Villa-Real** (US 4,481382).

As to Claim 14, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7.

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing selected accessory responses to callers (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** does not teach, “wherein a reminder to call the identified calling party will be stored into the portable terminal, in order to be presented to a user later”. Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add reminder capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention for alerting users as taught by **Villa-Real**’s invention in order to provide reminders to users when calls become due.

19. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wolff** et al. (US 5,327,486).

As to Claims 15-17, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance claim 1, wherein said reply includes:

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing callers with selected user accessory responses (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** does not teach, “time information”. **Wolff** teaches the limitation (Figures 8-9). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add time capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention for providing callers with selected time-based messages as taught by **Wolff**’s invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

20. Claims 1,7-9, 12-13, 20, 23-26, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** et al. (US 5,649,289).

As to Claims 1,20,23-25,29,33 and 37, with respect to Figures 1-2 and 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method for replying to a call coming to a portable terminal (mobile station 10, Fig.1) wherein, in response to an incoming call,

the portable terminal identifies a caller on the basis of caller ID [i.e., an identification information] (Col. 11, lines 8-15), or

**Mizikovsky** further teaches directing the incoming call to a selected accessory device such as a telephone answering machine (Col. 12, line 30) to service or answer the call (Col. 12, line 34).

**Mizikovsky** further teaches selecting an accessory device (i.e., telephone answering machine (hereinafter TAD)) and the device answers or service the call uniquely (such as TAD generates outgoing message (i.e., OGM) or fax machine generates CNG tone (i.e., calling tone) when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call) (Col. 6, lines 51-67, Col. 7, lines 27-30). Thus, the selected device answers the call reads on claimed “reply”. Also, each selected device must treat/service the call uniquely therefore, each device can produce a specific form of communication to the incoming call such as TAD generates OGM or fax machine generates CNG tone when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call (Col. 12, lines 25-37).

**Mizikovsky** further teaches the step of identifying the caller is accomplished by the portable terminal (Figure 1, label 50, Figure 2, label 114 and Figure 5, label 516).

**Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that the portable device sends the reply and provides a selected response to the caller **only through an action of the portable terminal** irrespectively of which of said plurality of forms of communication is employed in the selected response.

**Wang** teaches that this limitation (Col. 1, lines 18-34, Col. 3, lines 41-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of the portable device to send the reply and provide a selected response to the caller **only through an action of the portable terminal** irrespectively of which of said plurality of forms of communication is employed in the selected response into the mobile station

of **Mizikovsky** so that a user is not required to have any external connection to connect to the external accessory device to get the benefit of carrying both of the accessory device along with the mobile station easily as one unit.

As to Claim 7, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein said reply is at least partly formulated based on the identification of the calling party (Figure 5, label 506).

As to Claim 8, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7 wherein a reply is sent to certain identified calling parties only (Figure 5, labels 508,512).

As to Claim 9, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein the reply to be sent in response to the incoming call is different according to the respective company said call is coming from (Figure 5, labels 508,512,516).

As to Claims 12-13, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein said identification of the calling party is based on registered caller IDs (a telephone notebook) comprised by the communication (Figure 2, label 106).

As to Claims 26,30,34,38, **Mizikovsky** teaches a portable terminal in accordance with claim 25, wherein said step of taking response action comprises sending a reply to the caller, said reply being a voice message (one of the following: a voice message, e-mail message, facsimile, and an SMS message in the form of a character string) (Col. 8, lines 51-59).

21. Claims 2, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** further in view of **Jambhekar** et al. (US 5,848,356).

As to Claims 2,6, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein the portable terminal sends said reply immediately in response to an incoming call, and said plurality of forms of communication include a voice message.

**Mizikovsky** further teaches a facsimile peripheral which suggests a facsimile accessory and facsimile message; a multimedia terminal which suggests an e-mail accessory and response; EIA/TIA 15-54 alert messages which suggests a SMS accessory and response.

However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** does not teach, “an e-mail message, a facsimile message, and an SMS message in the form of a character string”. **Jambhekar** teaches e-mail, facsimile and SMS messages (Figures 5P and 8A). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add e-mail, facsimile and SMS capabilities to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Wang**’s invention for providing callers with response messages as taught by **Jambhekar**’s invention in order not to distract a user by sending pre-programmed responses.

22. Claims 3-5,28,32,36,40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** further in view of **Bremer** (US 6,018,671).

As to Claim 3, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein in response to

an incoming call,

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing users with alert signals and, therefore, waits for a user response (Figure 5, label 510). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** does not teach, “the portable terminal alarms and waits during a certain delay, and if a user during said delay does not answer said call, the portable terminal sends said reply”. **Bremer** teaches the limitation (Figure 4, labels 4 16,420). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add default capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Wang**’s invention for providing callers with default messages as taught by Bremer’s invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claims 4,28,32,36,40, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein in response to an incoming call, the portable terminal alarms, and:

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing users with alert signals and, therefore, waits for a user response (Figure 5, label 510). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** does not teach, “if a user gives a certain key command, the portable terminal sends said reply”. Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add selected message capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Wang**’s invention for providing callers with selected messages as taught by Bremer’s invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claim 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 3, wherein the portable terminal gives a mute soundless alarm (Col. 6, lines 43-50).

23. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** further in view of **Villa-Real** (US 4,481382).

As to Claim 14, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7.

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing selected accessory responses to callers (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** does not teach, “wherein a reminder to call the identified calling party will be stored into the portable terminal, in order to be presented to a user later”. Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add reminder capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Wang**’s invention for alerting users as taught by **Villa-Real**’s invention in order to provide reminders to users when calls become due.

24. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** further in view of **Wolff et al.** (US 5,327,486).

As to Claims 15-17, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance claim 1, wherein said reply includes:

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing callers with selected user accessory responses (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** does not teach, “time information”. **Wolff** teaches the limitation (Figures 8-9). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add time capability to

**Mizikovsky's** invention in view of **Wang's** invention for providing callers with selected time-based messages as taught by **Wolff's** invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

***Conclusion***

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MD S. ELAHEE whose telephone number is (571)272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/MD S ELAHEE/  
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2614  
May 11, 2009